



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Alps,—that, in fact, the Alps now represent the probable past of New England before it was reduced. He sums up as follows : “Our rugged New England landscape therefore offers in its larger features an excellent example of composite topography. Its upland is the remaining portion of an old lowland carved during a former cycle of denudation ; its valleys mark the adolescent stage of development reached in a later cycle, the change from the earlier to the later cycle being caused by a general tilting and warping of the region, whereby one part of its surface was uplifted. The drowned valleys along the coast mark an episode of depression late in the elapsed portion of the later cycle. The drift hills and gravel plains are the record of a peculiar accident—a glacial invasion—by which the normal advance of the cycle was for a time interrupted. These are the natural relations of our geographical features, and I believe that our plan of teaching should be closely in accord with them.”

The whole pamphlet is thoroughly helpful to teachers of geography. It emphasizes not only the physical element in geography, but also the need of a broad grasp of the subject by the teacher, and of intelligent methods and means of presenting the facts to the pupils. It should be epoch-making through its stimulating effect.

Ray Greene Huling.

High School, Cambridge, Mass.

Select Orations and Letters of Cicero, with an Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary. By FRANCIS W. KELSEY. Boston. Allyn & Bacon. 1892.

Professor Kelsey, in adding to the number of school editions of Cicero, was evidently prompted by a conviction that there was an advantageous position still unoccupied in the “Battle of the Books.” The book does not, to be sure, add anything new to our knowledge of Cicero, nor would the editor make such a claim for it. It aims merely to present certain important parts of what is already known in the most attractive and impressive form, and in this it is eminently successful. To eight orations of Cicero, viz., *in Catilinam* (I–IV), *de imperio Cn. Pompei*, *pro Marcello*, *pro Archia poeta*, *in Antonium* (IV), are added forty-six of his letters, selected from those written to members of his family, to Atticus and to other friends. The purpose of this addition is to introduce to the school-boy a side of Cicero’s life and thought which he commonly hears nothing about. The general introduction is divided into four parts. The first reviews the life of Cicero and gives an appreciative account of him as an orator, a writer, and as a man. In the second, after giving a general summary of all the orations, with the date at which each was delivered, the editor takes up each of the eight orations contained in the book, gives an account of the occasion and circumstances of delivery and of the events

that led up to it, and by careful analysis brings out clearly the masterly skill with which Cicero framed his argument to achieve his ends. This is so very systematically and carefully done that it may be called one of the features of the book. The third part consists of an essay on Private Correspondence in general among the Romans and on that of Cicero in particular. The fourth gives a useful table outlining the constitution of the Roman government in the time of Cicero, with reference to the citizens, the different assemblies, and officers and state priests, legal jurisdiction and provincial administration. Occasionally the editor is led by his desire for brevity into making statements that would give wrong impressions. On page 56, for instance, speaking of the form of a letter, he says, "the place of writing was given in the ablative," without mentioning the frequent occurrence also of the locative (*e. g.*, *Brundisi, Thessalonicae, Dyrrhochi*). On the same page he makes the general statement that the letters were probably given to the world by Tiro, without a reference to the important part played by Atticus in this connection. But the presentation of each topic is, for the most part, accurate and adequate.

As regards the text, there is little especially noteworthy. Professor Kelsey, breaking away from too common precedents in our school editions, writes *i* (instead of *ii*) for the genitive singular of nouns in *-ius, -ium*. It is to be regretted that he is not equally courageous in discarding such forms as *tuus, servus, vultus*, etc., when there is so little doubt that Cicero wrote *tuos, servos, vultus*, etc. There is some justification for *maximus, optimus*, (instead of *-umus*), but where the correct form is tolerably certain, no respect for precedent should make one hesitate to use it. In accusative plural of *i* stems, we find sometimes *es*, sometimes *is*, in the same words, *e. g.*, *cives*, 93, 19; 98, 19 (the figures referring to page and line); *civis*, 90, 25; *omnes*, 90, 16; 100, 31; *omnis*, 96, 7; 99, 2.

The notes are copious and almost always judicious, helpful and well calculated to inspire thought and interest. There are, of course, many opportunities for differences of opinion, but positive errors are comparatively few. In his note on 67, 8, "*pridie Kalendas Ianuarias, i. e.*, Dec. 31, in the year 66," Professor Kelsey forgets that, at the time in question, December had only 29 days. In 71, 32, *Habes ubi ostentes*, the mood is merely said to be the "subj. of characteristic." It is quite the fashion, in explaining such constructions, to disregard altogether the potential feeling that is prominent in the mood. Such clauses are materially different from clauses like *sunt qui putent*, and might be designated as potential characterizing clauses. In 77, 22, *fore ut . . . possem* is called "a round-about form of expression, made necessary by the lack of a fut. infin. of *posse*," regardless of the fact that *posse*, as well as *velle*, is very frequently used in just such cases, though in the case of other verbs that lack a fut. infin. the cir-

cumlocution would be necessary. In 105, 32, it is not clear what the editor means by saying *haberi* is "stronger than *factum esse*." *Factum esse* would mean nothing here. If *factum esse* is intended, the difference between this and *haberi* is not satisfactorily characterized by saying that the latter is "stronger." In 134, 7, (*quisquam dubitabit, quid virtute perfecturus sit?*), *perfecturus sit* is said to be "stronger than *perficiat*." There seems hardly more difference between the two than between our "He will do" and "He is going to do." *Quid perficiat* in the above passage would cause an ambiguity which *perfecturus sit* avoids. Sometimes the periphrastic form seems to be chosen from considerations of euphony. In 151, 3, *mortis atque exsili*, the note reads: "*atque* indicates that he considers exile worse than death." It is dangerous, and would be found difficult, always to insist upon so strict a use of *atque* even in Cicero. What is to be said, for instance, of such cases as *opem atque auxilium*, or such as *aequom ac ius* and *ius atque aequom* occurring side by side in the same author? Still less justifiable, as it seems to me, is the use of "but" to translate *atque* (151, 26) and *que* (88, 20), when the added idea is found to be logically adversative to the preceding. In the sentence "I love him and he hates me," "and" adds an adversative idea and "but" might well be substituted for it, but this is very different from saying that "and" is here equivalent to "but." The *atque* above cited will give good sense if rendered by "and" and the *neque que* of the other passage may be rendered "on the one hand not and on the other hand." On *simillimum deo* (161, 26) is asked the question: "Might *dei* have been expected?" Our editor evidently has in mind the doubtful rule that *similis* takes the genitive with living objects. The only distinction between the genitive and the dative with *similis* that is really worth mentioning is that the genitive was the almost invariable construction of early Latin, the dative that of Silver Latin. Between the two came the period of transition when the two cases were used indifferently. The present passage is a case in hand where the rule referred to does not hold, and others are not wanting. In 174, 11, *neque eum reciperet* is translated "and were not to receive him." "Were to receive" would translate *recipiat*, or *recepturus esset* in a condition, but it does not translate *reciperet*. There is a wide difference between "if he were to come" and "if he were coming." In *Brundisio profecti sumus prid. K. Mai.* (183, 14), the epistolary tense is made equivalent to "I am just setting out." This makes prominent the idea, entirely wanting in *profecti sumus*, of the progress of the act, which would have been expressed by *proficiscebamur*. "I set out (leave) to-day" would be a much nearer equivalent. The "leave," from the point of view of the person who receives the letter, would become the historical perfect ("He left the last day of April"), but "am leaving" would not. In 183, 19, it is

difficult to see why *agam* in *Opinor, sic agam*, is translated "I may put it this way." Surely, Professor Kelsey would not regard *agam* as subjunctive. *Vident et sentiunt idem quod vos i. e. videte et sentitis* is of course a misprint. The use of "thee" and "thou" is given as an English parallel to the retention of such archaic forms as *duint* (70, 17) in prayers. A closer parallel would be our use of the archaic subjunctive *e. g.*, "Thy Kingdom *come*, Thy will *be done*," etc. These few instances will suffice to illustrate what may be regarded as the faults of the book, but they are neither numerous enough, nor serious enough greatly to lessen its usefulness. Throughout the notes there are frequent references to the grammars of Allen and Greenough, Gildersleeve, and Harkness. After the notes come a few pages of "Helps to the Study of Cicero" which will be found useful especially to teachers. The last 150 pages of the book are devoted to a table of idioms and phrases and to a good vocabulary in which all long vowels are carefully marked. The book may be confidently recommended as an excellent edition for the use of preparatory schools.

H. C. Elmer.

Cornell University.

Some Hints on Learning to Draw. By G. W. CALDWELL HUTCHINSON. Art Master, Clifton College. MacMillan & Co., London and New York, 1893.

A book on "Learning to Draw" which starts out, in these days of rabid excitement about "manual training," with the assertion that the education of the eye to *see* is of more importance than that of the hand to *do*, cannot fail to interest one to look farther into its pages, which it is much to be regretted do not sustain this interest.

That the hand will obey the eye is a most valuable point to make, and cannot be too strongly insisted upon; but the hand will more readily obey the *mind*; and after the first promise of training the eye to the direct observation of nature, the author falls back into the old method of establishing *rules* to see by, and a system is formulated quite irrespective of some obvious effects which the eye ought to perceive.

The most elementary knowledge of perspective would show that a rectangular solid cannot be placed in such relation to the spectator as to exhibit three of its sides, and the appearance of only two of them be affected by the position; yet in the example given in the book, the one side is drawn full size; and as in figure 13, p. 36—"particular notice" is given that "G H is *not a receding line*." This is fundamentally wrong *as observation*, and is only admitted in the poorest sort of mechanical parallel perspective. Figure 6 shows this even more clearly, as it would be impossible for the observer to look along a line of such extent as